

REMARKS

Claims 1-4, 6, 7 and 8 are all the claims pending in the application, new claim 8 having added as indicated herein. Claims 1-3 are withdrawn from consideration. Claims 4 and 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Applicant's Admitted Prior Art (APA) in Fig. 6 in view of newly applied reference Gerrans, Jr. (U.S. Patent No.: 5,885,108), hereafter referred to as Gerrans. Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over the APA in Fig. 6 in view of Gerrans, and further in view of Hauchard et al. (U.S. Patent No.: 4,969,845), hereinafter referred to as Hauchard.

§ 103(a) Rejections (APA / Gerrans) – Claims 4 and 7

The Examiner rejects claims 4 and 7 for the reasons set forth on pages 2 and 3 of the Office Action. Applicant traverses these rejections at least for the following reasons.

The Examiner alleges, in part, in the Office Action:

Gerrans teaches a molded portion (16) wherein a circumferential size of the molded portion from a part corresponding to the terminal connecting portions is continuously reduced, so that the rear end portion has a same diameter as the cable (22), and wherein there is no increase in the circumferential size of the molded portion in a direction parallel to a direction in which the terminal fittings extend in order to provide a smoother gripping on the molded portion. Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to form the molded portion of APA being continuously reduced, as taught be Gerrans, to provide a smoother gripping on the molded portion. (Emphasis added.)

In response, first, Applicant submits that nowhere does Gerrans teach or suggest that the alleged molded portion of Gerrans provides a smoother gripping.¹ In fact, nowhere does Gerrans

¹ By using the words "smoother gripping", Applicant believes that the Examiner intends to indicate that the molded portion is better able to be seized or held.

discuss something or someone holding or gripping the outer covering 16. The Examiner simply states that the outer covering 16 provides a smoother gripping (*see bottom of page 2 of the Office Action*) without providing support for this assertion.

Yet further, even if, *assuming arguendo*, the outer cover 16 of Gerrans does provide a smoother gripping, as the Examiner asserts, it is not clear how the alleged smoother gripping outer covering 16 of Gerrans would have been incorporated into the APA, to arrive at the present invention. That is, nowhere does the present application disclose that the APA in Fig. 6, for example, would even be gripped. Moreover, even if it were to be gripped, or held, nowhere does the present application disclose where and/or how the APA structure would be gripped, or how it would benefit from the alleged smooth gripping molded portion of Gerrans. Therefore, in view of the above, one skilled in the art would not have been motivated to combine Gerrans with the APA, to provide a smoother gripping on the molded portion.

Therefore, at least based on the foregoing, Applicant submits that claims 4 and 7 are patentable over the applied references, either alone or in combination, and respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw his rejections of claims 4 and 7.

§ 103(a) Rejection (APA / Gerrans / Hauchard) – Claim 6

The Examiner rejects claim 6 for the reasons set forth on page 3 of the Office Action. Applicant submits that this claim is patentable at least by virtue of its dependency from claim 4. Hauchard does not make up for the deficiencies of the APA and Gerrans as discussed above.

Finally, Applicant adds new claim 8 to round out the scope of protection solicited for the present invention, and submits that this claim is patentable at least by virtue of its indirect dependency from claim 4.

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE



23373

PATENT TRADEMARK OFFICE

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in dark ink, appearing to read "Diallo T. Crenshaw", written over a horizontal line.

Diallo T. Crenshaw
Registration No. 52,778

Date: July 2, 2003